App. F. IX-4

Previous References

1933-34 (Miscellaneous)

File No. 58-33

Serial Nos. 1-4

Later References.

Late Reference
Misc 38-34 1-3

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos.

Part B for June 1934.

SUBJECT.

Petition of Mr R. Venkatarao, proprietor-Trustee of Venkata Rao's chattram Bangalore for reconsideration the Govt order, directing him taking over the management of the chattram by them.

To Mr R. Vasudeva Rao
Brindavanam Tanjore.

WD 01965—GPB—15,000—7-7-34

1538 of 29th May 34

Govt feel there is no reason to reconsider the orders already passed in the matter.

Serial No.

Petition dy 7-7-33 from Mr R. Vasudeva Rao, Managing trustee of Venkata Rao's Charities Bangalore — Brindavan - Tanjore stating that in the absence of specific charges levelled against the present Management of the Chattram at Mayavaram it is not possible for practicable to answer the Charges specifically and praying for the execution of orders for taking the Chattram under the Management of Government be held in abeyance pending final disposal on enquiry.

(1) vide last portion of para 4 of P.M. 01. Umbs in ref

K. The petition refers to an order of 22/6/29. (Govt no 2796-99/Mug 336-27-13 dy 22/6/29). It is evident that he is fully alive to the conditions imposed thereon & the improvements to be effected to the Institution in accordance with the directions given in the order referred to. Though the orders were passed so long back as June 1929 & the petr kept silent till the close of 1932 — a period ranging over nearly 3½ years — , the I. in his letter dy 14-2-33 recommended that the Institution & the endowments made thereto be brought under the control of the Commissioner for reasons set forth therein & the latter sanctioned in Govt no 1400-A/Mug 222-32-6 dy 3-4-33.

x P.

x W.

NOTE—Contn. Sheet

Mem. File No. of 193 . | General and Revenue Secretariat

(P. 6 N) against this order of 3-4-33

Hindu reader is also invited to the Mem. Collection 222-32-4 pertaining — which shows that he has unauthorisedly encroached a Rao The petitioner has asked in leasing out certain vacant land, adjacent to and belonging to the Chattram — Further he had also proposed a permanent lease of the remaining vacant land to one Mr P Srinivasa Rao, the President Manager of the Chattram, which was vetoed in this office letter no. 1398/Mem. 222-32-4 of 3/4/33 * V.

(1) In para 10 of P. on to I the petr proposes the withdrawal of endowed villages as an alternative to the non-revision of fees of — 3/4/33. Such measures are not adopted so far, only the Institution & the endowed lands have both been brought under Govt management in the circumstances a sufficient amount

(2) Negligence and Noticable irregularities have occurred in the management of the Chattram

(3) In these circumstances the points urged by the petitioner, in his petition cannot be considered tenable. The hereditary rights if any can be heard to offer his defence for what

GV 29/7

that the petr has not been attending to the affairs of the Chattram

Serial No.

as he ought to have done or cared to about is the conditions laid down in the G.O. of June 1929 (Flag K) is very clear from the M.C's report of Feb 33 (Flag P). As stated by him in his present petn, it is not possible either for him to exercise effective check over the affairs of the Chakram living as he does in Tanjore.

The reasons for (1) The petn is not duly stamped & (2) the petn has explained in para 11 of his petn.

(3) Whether the papers may be called for & the petr given a hearing are for orders.

2/8/33

(4) Secy)

(5) 2nd Member) 3.8.33 3/8/33

(6) The petr alleges in para 2 of his petn that he was not given notice of the enquiry etc - A report may be called for from the M.C. on the petn & the M.C. thereon

4/8

7/8

(10)

9/8/1933

2/9/33

Second Secretariat
4 AUG. 1933
No.....

TYPING SECTION
22. AUG. 1933
GENL. & REV. SECT.

NOTE—Contn. Sheet.

File No. [illegible] of 1933. | General and Secretariat

No 250 & 25/8/33 to Rec 2
Mysore Commissioner forwarding
his report the petitions received
to Govt

Letter no 348/33-34 & 28/3/34
from the Mysore Commissioner stating
that in the circumstances reported by the Deputy
Commissioner there are no grounds for
reconsideration of orders passed about
the Raghunatha Rao Chatram at Bangalore
and requesting approval to the recommendation
of the Deputy Commissioner for disposing of
the Chatram building at Kengeri
to one Nagappa for Rs 300/-.

12 No report furnished by
him with reference to para 9 supra —

GS Note
30.
1/5

13) In regard to the point referred to
in the II Members minute at para 9
supra, the D.C. in his letter dt 14.3.34
has stated as follows:—

(a) "It is true that no formal notice
has been given to the Trustee. A
notice has been served on the Manager
of the premises but the latter denied
that the notices should be sent to the proprietor
as he was not the Manager. The Manager
of the premises has all along been in

raised on the pet[n] of Mr R. (5)
Vasudeva Rao of Sewan Rao Bahadur Raghunatha
Rao's Chattram - at Bangalore

General and Revenue Secretariat — File No. 673 58 of 1933 4 — [App. F. III—2

Serial No.

Flag Z.

The Issue of the Several Orders in
which the Correspondence relating to the
Resumption of the Management of
the Charity to Govt has been going on.

5) In the Govt (in para 2) the Mrs.
Represents that the recommendation of
the D.C. to dispose of the dilapidated
Chattram Structure at Kengeri to one
Mr Raghunna for Rs 300/- may be affirmed
This is for orders.

2/5/34

OFFICE OF THE SECOND MEMBER OF GOVT COUNCIL. 14 MAY 1934 NO 7-5-7

Jt Secy) 2nd Asst)

14/5

2/1415

16. Though the proprietor might have been given notice, he seems to have had knowledge of the enquiry. On the merits there is no reason to reconsider the order passed. The recommn to sell the Kengeri chattram may be appd

15/5

15/5

17. Offr as per proposal in the draft

£-5
6/7/5

18 Issue

23/5/34

NOTE—Contn. Sheet.

WD 0434—GPB—15,000—12-10-33

6

Mun. File No. 58 of 1933. | General and Revenue Secretariat

Serial No. 4

No 1558 dy 29.5.34 to ~~the~~ Mr R. Vasudeva Rao., Proprietor-trustee of Bangalore Venkata Rao's Charity – Brindavan – Tanjore intimating that there are no reasons to reconsider the ~~order~~ proposed ~~of the Government~~ resumption of the ~~Kachery~~ Chattram at Bangalore, being taken by Government under their Management.

No 1559 dy 29.5.34 to the Municipal Commissioner forwarding copy of the above Endorsement and ~~affirming~~ his proposal to sell the Chattram building at Rengam to one ~~Mr~~ Nagappa for Rs 300/–

No 1560 dy 29.5.34 to the Comptroller.

No 1561 dy 29.5.34 to the President City Municipal Council Bangalore–

No 1562 dy 29.5.34 to the Revenue Commissioner forwarding copy of the above Endorsement.

No 1563 dy 29.5.34 to the Superintendent Revenue Survey and Settlement–

B ✓
2/6

Se by the Member, and forwarded to the Muzr Sectt. for disposal.

From

R. Vasudeva Rao,
Inamdar of Kharlapur,
and Proprietor-Trustee,
Venkata Rao's Choultry, Banglore,
"Brindavan", TANJORE.

Simla, 15th July 33.

To

Misc 58-33-1

S. P. Rajagopalachari Esquire Ba Bl.
Second member of Council
Public office
Bangalore

19/7/33

Sir,

I beg to introduce myself as the nephew of the late Dewan Bahadur R. Ragoonatha Rao and grandson of the late Rai Raya Rai R. Venkata Rao whose memory is perpetuated by the chathram on the Krishnarajendra Road leading to Basavangddy and as one of the four propritor-trustees of the chathram. You were, I learn, Sir, prior to taking up service in the Mysore Government a citizen of Kumbakonam and hece the members of the family of the late Dewan Bahadur Ragoonatha Rao may not be strangers to you.

A couple of days ago a friend of the family came to Tanjore from Bagglore and during the conversation, mention was made of the issue of an order directing that the chathram should be managed hereafter by Government. This was a bit surprising and disquieting news. A reference to my relative on the premises at Banglore fetched a reply that he was not aware of the issue of any such order. Even now, I am doubtful if any order could have issued without any enquiry and without my being made a party of it. I now approach you, Sir, with a request that you will be pleased to let me know if any order has issued and if so, that I may be favoured with a copy of the same.

For the past fifteen years it has been the misfortune of my family to be misunderstood by the subordinate officers of Government in anything that it does in the affairs of the Chathram. They seem to view the management with suspicion. It may be that they beleive that the family is making a living out of the income of the Chathram and making private use of a building which is dedicated for public use.

The chathram at Banglore has been in existence for about one hundred years nearly and it has always been the practice to keep a family on payment on the premises to look after the structure and to the convenience of the travellers as the family of the donors has no permanent residence at Banglore and live at Tanjore and Kumba-Konam. It will be seen on personal inspection of the present premises that the front portion has been designed constructed and separated from the main building for occupation by the person who lives on the premises and the family of the donours when it visits Banglore. There are only two suites of rooms seperated by a big vacant courtyard for the manager or caretaker and the other for use by the proprietor-trustees who visit Banglore at least twice a yearfor inspection of the chathram and its accounts. The present occupant being a member of my family, he has besides the use of his own portion permitted the use of the other set also. This portion which is not meant for the use of the travellers was built and completed recently and as such has been put to much less use than the main building which was built more than 25 or 30 years ago. Hence there is a fresh appearance about it. It was origannally designed that the main building of the chatnram which contains 12 rooms--six large and six small-- should accommodate 6 families only, the large room being used for sitting and other purpose and the small room being converted into a kitchen. As the demand for rooms rose in volume, the use of fire-wood in the kitchen was prohibited and charcoal stoves were replaced in their place. The travellers being mostly eye patients welcomed this innovation and the result has been that 12 families are accommodated at the same time. There is considerable difference in the appearance of premises used by the public and private families. The sub-ordinate officers of Government looking at the tidy and neat appearance of the front portion as contrasted with the hind portion which is much used by travellers have an impression created in them that the best is being utilised by the family. During the year 1929 such a charge was levelled against the management and to the good luck of the family, the chathram was honoured with a visit

by the then First Member of Council (the present acting Dewan) and the result was the issue of Government Order dated 20/22nd June, 1929 from which the following is extracted:--

"******This building is well kept. It is mostly used by the patients under treatment in the Eye Hospital or their attendants, and almost all the rooms are in occupation by them throughout the year. This chathram is serving a useful purpose.******" ~~This chathram is~~ The above extract speaks itself and has been the result of the labours of the present occupant of the premises. Living on the premises with pools of water in front and amidst mosquitoes and with a few patients on hand always (with no neighbourly amenities) is not an enviable lot for any person and much less to a person who earns in Government Service and who renders service to the chathram without remuneration. An inspection by you, Sir, will convince you of the truth or otherwise of the above statements. We being absentee proprietor-trustees have always to depend upon a local man to look after the properties. By the present arrangement of having a member of the family on the premises, the chathram is saving annually Rs.200/- or so which ought to be spent by way of salary. I beg to assure the government that the present incumbent is lving on the premises more at our desire and in the interests of the Chathram than for any personal gain and as long as he is willing to do so, it will be to the benefit of the chathram. In view of the above facts, I am sure Government will agree with me--absentee proprietor--trustee--that the present arrangement warrants the proper use of the rooms by the travellers and the protection of the chathram building from careless and rough use. Recently the present occupant of the premises volunteered to construct a building for himself and at his own cost, should he be offered a site on an annual ground rent of Rs.50/-. This proposal would have increased the income by Rs.50. This proposal when submitted to Government for approval was turned down.

As regards the income ~~from~~ from the endowed lands, right economy in expenditure is practised and only the barest expenses are incurred.

10

The accounts are maintained regularly and are always open to inspection by officers of Government. Recently the S. D. O. and the D.C. perused them during inspection .

7) Their submission has so far not been insisted and should the same be done, the accounts will be submitted regularly.

The Mysore Government need no specific mention of the sad plight of the Mirasdars of the Tanjore District--of whom the proprietor-trustees are a few--when the whole of India is aware of the same. It has not been possible to have any surplus after the sale of agricultural produce as the prices are very low. Further the Government advised me when I presented myself before the then First Member of Council in the year 1929 not to incur any more debts for the improvement of the Chathram. Being deprived of the possibility of raising a loan and with no surplus on hand, by the sale of agricultural produce, it has become impossible for me to attend to several items of additions and improvements so kindly suggested by Government. As the work cannot be undertaken piece meal, I have been compelled to postpone to a distant date the execution of this work for which at least a sum of Rs.3,000 will be required.

In the absence of the specific charges levelled against the present management, it is not possible nor practicable to answer the charges specifically. I request you, Sir. to kindly give me an opportunity by summoning me to wait and on you on any day convenient to you and even, after hearing from me what I have to say, you are inclined for a change, the same mercy then be adopted making due provision for the repayment of outstandings to the time of about Rs.14,000 which were submitted to Government in the year, 1929 and the interest on certain items of the above loan is being paid fro the private funds of the family as agreed to by me in 1929 before the then First Member of Council.

8) In the meantime, the execution of the order already issued, if any, may kindly be ordered to be held in abeyance pending final de-

11

by you on enquiry. Should the above proposals not meet with the approval of Government, I am, on behalf of the four proprietor-trustees, reluctantly compelled to appreach the Government with the following alternative requ&st. The endowments so generously granted and for the past 90 years allowed to be enjoyed by the family on behalf of the chathram may kindly be withdrawn. The family is fully aware that the grant was made, as is evident ~~fund~~ from the sannad more in recognition of the eminent services rendered to the State by the illustrious ancestor of the family whose name is perpetuated by this Chathram and which is the only link between the State and the family--than in consideration of anything else. Besides this charity, the family possesses no other property in the State. The above request has not been made in any challenging spirit but with the hope that such a step would enable the family to advance money from private funds or raise loans for effecting improvements to the chathram. It is the desire of the family to render the chathram very useful to the travellers and it believes that the Government is actuated with the same desire. Since the objects of Government and the family are identical, Government will be pleased to treat the Chathram as a new Muzarai institution for which act of kindness the family will be greatful to Government. In these transactions, the sole object of the family is to keep the memory of Late Venkata Rao green in the minds of the public.

Living as I do at Tanjore and being anxious to despatch this representation as early as possible without waiting for obtaining the necessary stamps--if necessary--which are not available locally and are to be obtained from Banglore, I have ventured to submit this without stamps, and with a request that the same may not kindly be rejected in that score. If I am kindly apprised of the value of the stamps to be affixed, I shall immediately arrange for its delivery at the office.

12) Trusting to hear from you and begging to be excused for the length

I remain,

Sir,

your most obedient servant,

R Venkatarama Rao

"Brindavan"
Tanjore
7.7.33.

From
R. Valendrayalu,
Inamdar of Kanbapur,
and Proprietor. Inamdar
Venkatarao Chowdry, Bangalore
Brindavanam. Bangalore.

To.
S. P. Rajagopalachariar Esquire
Bangalore
Second Member of Council
Public office
Bangalore.

Sir

Since writing my Registered letter
dated the 6th inst my agent visited me today
that a Kannada native woman servant
came on the 2nd inst by the Cauvery of Bangalore
Salem (at Bangalore) in connecting train coming
of Gooti (Anantapur district, Madras
having absconding the assets of [illegible]
misappropriation of her [illegible]
under Sec 184 (Act 2 of 1882) [illegible]
and Chamiers Law Relating [illegible]
after the Lapse of Six months.

have mentioned on indirectly on page 33

It is a matter of [illegible]
that the Cauvery should [illegible]
Cauvery about or between [illegible]
encouraged [illegible]
breach [illegible]
to [illegible]
in the Regulations in [illegible]
Cauvery. as the [illegible]
kind between [illegible]
which the [illegible]
honour to [illegible]

Your [illegible]

writing to the Press
seems to be
necessary and even this has been denied.

Under the above circumstances I
beg for the re review of the awards
[illegible] a list of changes [illegible]
[illegible] arrangements may [illegible]
[illegible]

[illegible] Grant many also
[illegible] me for being
[illegible]

[illegible] I respectfully
beg of you to [illegible] the favourable order
[illegible]

[illegible]

Yours very Obediently Servant
W Tecumseh Sherman

14

GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE

FINANCIAL SECRETARIAT,

No. 250

Dated, Bangalore, 23d August 1933

Mcy 58-33-2 25th

From A.N. Raghavachar, Esq., M.A.,
~~S. SHAMANNA, Esq., B. A.~~
Financial Secretary to the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore.

To

The Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore,

Bangalore.

Sir,

I am directed to forward herewith two petitions dated 7th July 1933 received from Mr R. Vasudeva Rao, Proprietor-trustee of Venkata Rao's Choultry, Bangalore, the management of which has been ordered to be taken over by Government, stating among other matters that he was not given notice of the enquiry, etc., and to request you to be so good as to submit a report on the petitions at an early date.

The petitions may kindly be returned with the report.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

for Financial Secretary to Government

Ags/2

15

Appendix F G—1]

SUBJECT .....

.....

.....

Section Mis 3

File No. 58-32

Serial No. 2

Diary No. of letter replied to ....

No. 25 Enclosure

To

The M.C

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the *193* .

Sir,

I am directed to forward herewith two petitions dated 7.7.33 received from Mr. R. Vasudeva Rao, Proprietor - Trustee of Venkata Chari Boy Bangalore City to state that the petitioner in the two petitions that he was not given notice of the enquiry held and to request you to be good enough to furnish on the petitions a report at an early date, as the petitioner may have to appear before the Council for the purpose.

I am Sir

Your obedient servant

Date of issue 25/8/33

Signed by Mr B. Muddukrishnappa

To be returned.

The management which has been ordered to be taken over by Govt. stating among other matters,

List of enclosures.....

Copied by.....

Examined by.....

187

Muz 58- 33-3 (16)

No. 348/33-34
Enc 2 Files

Office of the Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore,
Bangalore dated 25th March 1934.
28

From

N. Madhava Rau, Esq., B.A., B.L.,
Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore.



To

S. Shamanna, Esq., B.A.,
Secretary to the Government of Mysore,
Financial Department.

Sir,

Subject:- Affairs of Dewan Bahadur Raghunatha Rao's Chattram at Bangalore and Kengeri.

With reference to your letter No.250/Muz.58-33-2 dated 25-8-1933, calling for a report on the points raised by Mr. R. Vasudeva Rao, Proprietor of the above Chattram in his review petition before Government, I have the honor to forward herewith the entire records received with the Bangalore Deputy Commissioner's report No.C3-4294/32-33 dated 14-3-1934 (copy enclosed) together with this office file No.R.Dis.200/32-33 dated 10-4-1933 and to state that in the circumstances reported by the Deputy Commissioner, there does not appear to be sufficient grounds for ~~the~~ a reconsideration of the case.

2. As regards the Chattram building at Kengeri, the Deputy Commissioner reports that the dilapidated structure may be disposed of to one Mr. Naganna for a sum of Rs 300/-, which appears to be the highest bid obtainable. I request that this recommendation of the Deputy Commissioner may be approved. A copy of the Deputy Commissioner's report dated 21-11-1933 is enclosed for reference.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

N. Madhava Rau

Muzrai Commissioner.

Letter No. C3-4294/32-33 dated 14-3-34 from the Deputy Commissioner, Kolar District, to the Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore.

With reference to your No.348/33-34 dated 26th December 1933 calling for a report on the petition of Mr. R. Vasudeva Rau, Proprietor Trustee of Venkata Rao's Choultry, Bangalore, I have the honor to state that the main points urged in the petition are:-

(1) that the order directing the resumption of the chattram has been passed without enquiry and without his being made a party to it;

(2) that no specific charges have been framed against the management;

(3) that the family has not been making private use of the building which is dedicated for public purpose;

(4) that the front portion of the building has been designed and constructed for occupation by the Manager of the premises without curtailing the facilities for travellers and the man now in occupation of it is rendering voluntary services to the Chattram and is there more in the interests of the Chattram than for private benefit;

(5) that income from lands is used for the barest expenditure

(6) that accounts have been maintained regularly and are always open to inspection; and

(7) that the work of improvements has been postponed owing to the present economic depression.

It is true that no formal notice has been given to the trustee. A notice has been served on the Manager of the premises but the latter desired that the notices should be sent to the proprietor as he was not the Manager. The Manager of the premises has all along been in the know of the several stages in which the correspondence relating to the resumption of management of the Choultry to Government has been going on. But so far as the condition of Chattram and the maintenance of the accounts and the utilisation of the income are concerned, the matter has been carefully looked into by the Sub Division Officer and myself and the result of our inspections has been reported in detail in my letter No.C3-1476/25 dated the 5th December 1932. It will be seen therefrom that the management of the Chattram is hardly satisfactory and the recommendation to take over management was made for proper reasons.

The connected records are herewith sent for reference and return.

"COPY"

C. Rudrappa

For Muzrai Commissioner

e Deputy Commissioner, Bangalore

ssioner in My e.

nce to your Memo No.R.Dis.200/32-33 dated 10-4-33 re: the af-

Dewan Bahadur Raghunatha Rao's Chattram at Bangalore and Kengeri, I

the honor to state that a notice communicating the orders of Government .

s reported to have been issued to the Manager of the Chattram, Mr. P. Srinivsa Rau as per para 1 of your Memo.

As regards the disposal of the chattram building at Kengeri referred to in para 2 of your Memo under reply it is reported that the Amildar with difficulty induced ~~are~~ one Mr. Naganna to get it purchased for a sum of Rs 300/-, He has also given a statement before the Amildar to this effect. As there were no bidders in the sales previously held, I am of opinion that the dilapidated chattram at Kengeri may be disposed of for the present offer of Rs 300/-.

The records are enclosed.

"COPY"

G. Rudrappa

For Muzrai Commissioner.

GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE.

No. 1538

Mug 58-33-4

General and Revenue Secretariat,

Dated Bangalore 25th May 193 4

29th

NOTIFICATION.

Endorsement.

Copy forwarded to Mr.R.Vasudeva Rao,
Proprietor-Trustee of
Rao Bahadur Venkata Rao's Charities
"Brindavan", TANJORE.

With reference to [illegible] to the Second Member of Council praying for a revision of the orders directing the taking over by Government of the management of Venkata Rao's Choultry at Mangalore and the Maravanthe Thurai lands endowed thereto, Mr.R.Vasudeva Rao is informed that there are no reasons to reconsider the orders already passed in the matter.

By order,
M.N.Krishnaswamy Iyengar
Financial Secretary to Government.

No 1559 of 29.5.34 to the Mangalore Com
forwarding copy of the above Endorsement and
approving of his proposal to sell the Ch
Building at Kengal for Rs 3001-

No 1560 of 29.5.34 to the Comptroller

No 1561 of 29.5.34 to the President Bang
City Municipal Council.

No 1562 of 29.5.34 to the Revenue Com

No 1563 of 29.5.34 to the Superintendent Revenue
Stamps

Appendix F G—1]

SUBJECT .....

.....

.....

9 cwts

Section Mun.

File No. 58-33

Serial No. 4.

Diary No. of letter replied to 1070

No. Endt. 1555

To

Mr. R. Vasudeva Rao
Properties Trustee of Bangalore
Venkataramana Chaultry.
Bangalore - Cantt.

Date of issue 29-5-34

Signed by ..... K. V. Krishnaswami
Dy. Sec.

With reference to your letter dt. 7.7.33 addressed to the Secretary to Government praying for a review of the order directing the Hackney carriages by Trustees of the Management of Venkataramana Chaultry at Bangalore to the Dharmadaya Inam [illegible] and owned [illegible] may not be taken over by Govt.

Sir R. Vasudeva Rao is informed that the request for a review of the orders above referred to cannot be acceded to.

List of enclosures ..... Nil

Copied by .....

Examined by .....

WD 71—GBPM—40,000—20-7-31.

Cens to m.c. with reference to his letter

No 248 - 3 - 34 dated 28/5/34 of the Collector intimating that the Recommended by him the Vice-Chairman of the D.C. Bangalore Dn to sell the Chattram building at Kengeri to Mr. Nagappa for a sum of Rs 300/- which has been held by him is approved. The Records relating to the sale may be returned.

B.O
Ind
23/5/34
For Head

1560 dt 29/5-34

Copies to (i) The Chairman (ii) President, Bangalore City Municipal Council (iii) The Revenue Superintendent Rural Survey

1561 dt 29/5/34

1562 & 1563

dt 29-5-34

Kms
23/5/34
For Head